

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Initially, Applicant would like to express his appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action provided. Applicant also notes with appreciation Examiner's acknowledgment of Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement filed in the present application by the return of the initialed and signed PTO-1449 form and the Examiner's acknowledgment of Applicant's claim for priority and receipt of the certified copies of the priority documents in the Official Action. Applicant further gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of the allowability of claims 2-9 and 12-20.

Upon entry of the present paper, claims 21-27 will have been added, with claims 1-27 remaining pending for consideration by the Examiner. Applicant notes that newly-added claims 21-27 generally respectively correspond to original claims 1-2, 4-6, 9 and 10, and further recite a digital camera having, *inter alia*, a body. In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of all the claims pending in the present application. Such action is respectfully requested and is now believed to be appropriate.

Turning to the merits of the action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication US 2001-0017738 to NOMURA (commonly-assigned to Applicant's Assignee), finding that this reference teaches all limitations of these claims.

As discussed *supra*, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Applicant submits that NOMURA, as well as the other references of record, are markedly different from the present claimed invention. Specifically, as discussed *supra*, NOMURA fails to teach or suggest at

P23686.A03

least the claimed features that the engaging projection of the second rotatable ring engages with the at least one circumferential guide groove together with said at least one rotation-guiding projection, as claimed in independent claim 1 (and newly-added independent claim 21). Rather, in NOMURA the engagement surface 18a of the second ring (second cam barrel 18) does not contact a circumferential guide groove of an annular ring (stationary barrel 11) engagement surface. In fact, as shown, *inter alia*, in Figs. 2 and 11 of NOMURA, no portion of the second ring contacts the annular ring.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that NOMURA, as well as the other references of record, fails to teach or suggest the invention of independent claim 1 (or of newly-added independent claim 21), as well as the claims dependent therefrom.

With respect to the Examiner's rejection of dependent claims 2-3, 10 and 11, since these claims are dependent from allowable independent claim 1, which is allowable for at least the reasons discussed supra, these dependent claims are also allowable for at least these reasons. Further, all dependent claims (including newly-added dependent claims 22-27) recite additional features which further define the present invention over the references of record. It is thus respectfully submitted that all rejected claims are patentably distinct from the references of record.

Absent a disclosure in a single reference of each and every element recited in a claim, a prima facie case of anticipation cannot be made under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Since the applied reference fails to disclose each and every element recited in independent claim 1, and the claims dependent therefrom, these claims are not anticipated thereby. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

P23686.A03

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that each and every pending claim of the present application meets the requirements for patentability under 35 U.S.C. §102, and respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate the allowance of each and every pending claim in the present application.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the present paper is in proper form and that none of the references either taken together or taken alone in any proper combination thereof, anticipates or renders obvious Applicant's invention. Accordingly, consideration of the present Response, reconsideration of the outstanding Official Action and allowance of the present application and all of the claims therein are respectfully requested and are now believed to be appropriate.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,  
Hiroshi NOMURA

*Will. Bernstein*  
*Reg. No. 44,550*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bruce H. Bernstein  
Reg. No. 29,027

January 14, 2005  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Applicant wishes to express his appreciation to Examiner Smith for the interview of December 28, 2004. During the interview, Applicant's representative, Attorney William Boshnick, spoke to the Examiner concerning the rejected claims of the present invention. Specifically, Attorney Boshnick showed a model of an embodiment of the present claimed invention as well as a model similar to that disclosed in the applied NOMURA US 2001-0017738 Publication (in which the present inventor is a common inventor), and demonstrated how this reference failed to teach or suggest the invention as claimed in rejected claims 1-3,10 and 11. The Examiner agreed that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest at least the feature that the second rotatable ring engages with the at least one circumferential guide groove together with said at least one rotation-guiding projection, as claimed in independent claim 1.<sup>1</sup> However, the Examiner indicated that he would conduct an updated search before making a final decision on allowance.

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicant notes that in the Interview Summary, the Examiner noted that "the second ring has at least one circumferential guide groove," but Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner intended to note that the second ring engages said at least one circumferential guide groove, and that the above is a clerical error, since claim 1 recites that the annular ring includes this circumferential guide groove. Should the Examiner have any questions or objections in this regard, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant.